



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,874	03/19/2004	David E. Wang	030499	7654

23696	7590	03/05/2008
QUALCOMM INCORPORATED		
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.		
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121		

EXAMINER	
YUN, EUGENE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2618	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com  
kscanla@qualcomm.com  
nanm@qualcomm.com

<b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. 10/804,874	Applicant(s) WANG ET AL.	
	Examiner EUGENE YUN	Art Unit 2618	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 14 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
see attached sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/14/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Firstly, even though the examiner used the same two references in the last action, the grounds of rejection were significantly different. In the action dated 7/2/2007, the examiner cited Ramesh in order to read on the limitation stating "Providing at least one of the faded signals to each of the wireless subscriber stations under test". That limitation was amended to state "transmitting the plurality of independently faded signals to each of the wireless subscriber stations under test", which changed the scope of the claims. Therefore, instead of Ramesh, the examiner turned to Marchetto in order to read on the amended limitation, which overall, is indeed new grounds of rejection.

The applicant's argument stating that the Ramesh and Marchetto references do not teach anything about testing a wireless station is incorrect. In the Ramesh reference, col. 2, lines 35-41 teaches adjusting a received signal according to interpolation results, which clearly defines testing a wireless station. The references do not require the actual term of "test" and since the term in the claims is not elaborated on or specifically defined, the cited passage stated above can indeed define testing of a wireless station.

Ramesh is believed to clearly teach the limitations of "Generating a broadcast signal" (see col. 3, lines 21-25 noting that the AM signal is the broadcast signal); and

Art Unit: 2618

“creating a plurality of independently faded signals from the broadcast signal” (see col. 6, lines 17-21). The cited passages simply state that the AM signal (the broadcast signal) is divided into a plurality of faded signals, and since there is not any more additional specifics in these limitations, then the cited passage is believed by the examiner to clearly read on the above limitations.

Therefore, the last limitation, which states “transmitting the plurality of independently faded signals to each of the wireless subscriber stations under test” is believed to be taught by Marchetto as this limitation is believed to teach nothing more than wirelessly transmitting a plurality of faded signals to another wireless device. Fig. 3 of Marchetto teaches two (which is a plurality) faded signals 68 and 70 transmitted to another wireless device. Note that the limitation does not state that the wireless stations under test are not necessarily a plurality of stations. The wording “each of the wireless stations under test” can still mean one station since the limitation does not state the term plurality. Even though the heading of the claims states “a plurality of wireless subscriber stations”, the claim does not specifically state that the faded signals are transmitted to a plurality of subscriber stations.


The examiner believes that the independent claims are still read on by Ramesh and Marchetto as currently written and believes that more detail is required in order to overcome the references.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EUGENE YUN whose telephone number is (571)272-7860. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew D. Anderson can be reached on (571)272-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
Eugene Yun  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2618

EY

  
Matthew D. Anderson  
Supervisory Patent Examiner